



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,818	08/29/2001	Olivier Guiter	PALM-3693	8438
49637	7590	02/08/2006	EXAMINER	
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C. 9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CA 90069			BECK, ALEXANDER S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2675	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/942,818	GUITER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alexander S. Beck	2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5,7,20,24,28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 5,7,20,24,28 and 29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Acknowledgement is made of the amendment filed by the Applicant on 6/13/05, in which: Claims 4,19,21,22 and 25-27 were canceled; and new Claims 28 and 29 were added. **Claims 5,7,20,24,28 and 29 are currently pending in U.S. Application Serial No. 09/942,818, and an Office Action on the merits follows.**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 5,7,20,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 3Com Corporation (Handbook for the Palm V Organizer, 1999, hereinafter “3Com®”) in**

view of *Derocher* (US 6,822,640 B2, hereinafter “*Derocher*”) and *Kobayashi* (US 2001/0044319 A1, hereinafter “*Kobayashi*”).

As to independent Claims 5 and 20, 3Com® teaches/suggests a method for displaying information comprising: a first touch screen region (e.g., graffiti writing area) of a hand held device in an area identified by permanent printing (e.g., icons on application launcher), wherein said hand held device comprises a main display screen region (e.g., screen) distinct from said first screen region, said main display screen region free of any area of permanent printing, wherein said first screen region is implemented using a first screen unit, and said main display screen region is implemented using a second display screen unit (3Com®: pages 6,7,15-20).

3Com® does not disclose expressly wherein the first touch screen region is a display screen implemented using a first display screen unit for displaying computer generated information, or displaying said computer generated information on said first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off said second display screen unit.

*Derocher* teaches/suggests a computing device comprising a main display screen region (e.g., a display of a laptop); and a touch screen region (e.g., touchpad) that is implemented using a display screen unit for displaying computer generated information (*Derocher*: col. 7, lines 1-12). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of 3Com® such that the first touch screen region was implemented using a display screen unit (hereinafter “first display screen unit”) for displaying computer generated information, as taught/suggested by *Derocher*. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a user with another means for entering information (*Derocher*: col. 7, lines 10-12).

Kobayashi teaches/suggests a hand held device comprising a first display screen unit 26 and a second display screen unit 20, and displaying information on said first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off said second display screen unit (*Kobayashi*: pages 2-3, par. [0030,0034-0035]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of 3Com® and Derocher such that information was displayed on the first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off the second display screen unit, as taught/suggested by Kobayashi. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce electric power consumed by selectively using the display screen units depending on existing conditions (e.g., second display screen unit being on or off) (*Kobayashi*: page 2, par. [0030]).

As to independent **Claim 7 and Claims 28 and 29**, most of the claim limitations have already been discussed and met by references 3Com®, Derocher and Kobayashi, as detailed in the above paragraphs regarding independent Claims 5 and 20, with the exception of: sending information for a clock display to said first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off said display screen unit.

As detailed above, the disclosures of 3Com®, Derocher and Kobayashi combine to teach/suggest sending information to said first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off said second display screen unit. 3Com® teaches/suggests wherein the handheld unit is capable of displaying information for a clock on the second display screen unit (3Com®: page 23). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the information to be displayed on the first display screen unit of 3Com®, Derocher and Kobayashi, such that information to be displayed included clock data, as taught/suggested by 3Com®. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have

been to conveniently provide a user a clock in the event that the second display screen unit is turned off.

Moreover, the Examiner takes Official Notice that displaying information for a clock display to a smaller auxiliary display (e.g., first display screen unit) on a hand held device is old and well-known in the art. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of 3Com®, Derocher and Kobayashi such that the first display screen unit displayed information for a clock display (automatically in response to a signal for turning off said second display screen unit, as detailed in the above paragraphs). The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently provide a user with information regarding the time of day.

4. **Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 3Com Corporation (Handbook for the Palm V Organizer, 1999) in view of Derocher (US 6,822,640 B2) and Lenchik et al. (US 6,658,272 B1, hereinafter “Lenchik”).**

As to independent Claim 24, most of the claim limitations have already been discussed and met by references 3Com® and Derocher, as detailed in the above paragraphs regarding independent Claims 5 and 20, with the exception of: in response to an event, displaying computer generated information on a second display screen region identified by permanent printing therein, wherein said event is an incoming phone call and wherein said computer generated information is a dialog enabling the receipt of said phone call.

3Com® does not disclose expressly wherein the hand held personal digital assistant is capable of receiving incoming calls.

Lenchik teaches/suggests a hand held personal digital assistant that is capable of receiving incoming calls (inherently including data prompting a user for receipt of said incoming calls) (*Lenchik: col. 4, lines 53-64*). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of 3Com® and Derocher such that the hand held device was capable of receiving incoming calls, as taught/suggested by Lenchik. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enable the personal digital assistant to function as a cellular phone (*Lenchik: col. 4, lines 53-64*).

As discussed above, the combined teachings of 3Com® and Derocher suggest the display screen associated with permanent printing (e.g., "second display screen region" in this particular claim) capable of displaying "applications that occasionally present a window that notifies the user of a specific, required action" (*Derocher: col. 7, lines 7-10*). Thus, when the teachings of 3Com® and Derocher are taken in view of Lenchik, it is apparent that the data prompting a user for receipt of an incoming call constitutes "applications that occasionally present a window that notifies the user of a specific required action" (as disclosed by Derocher), and therefore displays computer generated information on the second display screen region identified by permanent printing therein, wherein said event is an incoming phone call and wherein said computer generated information is a dialog enabling the receipt of said phone call.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 5,7,20,24,28 and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Alexander S. Beck** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7765**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Sumati Lefkowitz** can be reached on **(571) 272-3638**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

asb  
1/24/06

*Sumati Lefkowitz*  
**SUMATI LEFKOWITZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**